

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of August 31, 2005.


DOUBLE PATENTING

The Examiner has provisionally rejected Claims 1-10 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 6 of co-pending application 10/709,779. The Examiner further notes that Claims 1-9 are allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, applicants are providing a terminal disclaimer in order to overcome the double patenting rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above reconsideration and allowance of this application with Claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,


RICHARD A. JOEL
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 22212

Dated: November 17, 2005